



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,657	06/29/2001	Victor R. Herrero	POU920010051US1	8494

23334 7590 02/10/2005

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI
& BIANCO P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER

ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,657

Applicant(s)

HERRERO, VICTOR R.

Examiner

Trent J Roche

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed 14 October 2004.
2. Per applicant's request, amended claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17 have been entered. Claim 16 has been canceled. Claims 1-15 and 17 are pending.
3. Claims 1-15 and 17 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

4. The declaration filed on 14 October 2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Kelley et al. reference.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

6. In light of the applicant's amendments regarding claims 9 and 15, the rejection under 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

7. In light of the applicant's cancellation of claim 16, the rejection under 35 USC § 101 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3-12, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,715,314 to Payne et al., hereafter referred to as Payne, in view of U.S. Patent 5,845,077 to Fawcett.

Per claim 1:

Payne discloses:

- a method on a client server network for the ordering, downloading, and installation of products (Note Figure 1 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- presenting to a user a list of products on a client system; receiving a user selection for ordering at least one product from the list of products on a product ordering server (Note Figure 2A, item 30, 32 and 34 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- receiving a response to the order for at least one product from the product ordering server, the response includes an entitlement ID for authorizing the use of the product, wherein the entitlement ID is sent from the product ordering server to the product delivery server ("The payment computer is programmed to received the payment message, to cause an access message to be created that comprises the product identifier and an access message

Art Unit: 2124

authenticator based on a cryptographic key, and to cause the access message to be sent to the merchant computer...” in col. 1 lines 59-64)

- requesting a download copy of the at least one product from the product delivery server, the request includes the entitlement ID previously received from the product ordering server (Note Figure 2H, item 92 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- receiving, in response to the entitlement ID received from the product ordering server matching the entitlement ID received with a request for the download copy, the copy of the at least one product from a scheduling server as part of a payload (“to cause the product to be sent to the user desiring to buy the product...” in col. 2 lines 1-2)

substantially as claimed. Payne does not explicitly disclose that the product is software, nor does Payne disclose the installation of the software product after receiving the software product, nor the inclusion of an installation script. Fawcett discloses a system enabling a user to view and purchase software for installation and to automatically install the application independently of the user (“a user selection of desired software...” in col. 11 lines 60-61. Further, “downloading the desired software to the first computer, and installing the desired software on the first computer...” in col. 12 lines 42-44. The installation is performed automatically, as shown in col. 10 lines 49-54.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the product distribution system of Payne to allow software distribution and installation as described by Fawcett, as this allow a user to purchase and install software easily via the Internet without the burden of obtaining software from a physical retailer.

Per claim 3:

Art Unit: 2124

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Payne does not explicitly disclose sending system information as claimed. Fawcett discloses the ability to send system information as claimed (Note at least Figure 4A, item 70 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send system information as disclosed by Fawcett to a product distribution server as disclosed by Payne, as this would allow the product server to identify new computer software, patches, and fixed required by the client, as disclosed by Fawcett in col. 7 lines 23-44.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Payne does not explicitly disclose the ordering of the software file from the software ordering server only when the software file is needed for use. Fawcett discloses the downloading of software files only when the software files are needed (“indicating software available...and not installed on the user computer...an alert about a defect in software on the user computer correctable by software available...” in col. 13 lines 3-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the product ordering system disclosed by Payne order only when a software file is required as disclosed by Fawcett, as this would increase user productivity by not requiring the user to constantly check for software updates.

Per claims 5-8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Payne does not explicitly disclose that the installation of the received copy of the at least one software file requires no further intervention from the software ordering server, requires no client user intervention, does not allow any choices or

Art Unit: 2124

options by a user, and obviates the need for help to install as claimed. Fawcett discloses an automated installation process requiring no further intervention from the ordering server, a user, or additional help ("With automatic downloading and installation of computer software from the update service, the user is relieved from the burden of obtaining software...and installing the computer software on the user computer." in col. 10 lines 49-56. The automated installation sequence inherently would not require user intervention, allow user choices, and obviate the need for help to install.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an automated installation system as disclosed by Fawcett in the product ordering system disclosed by Payne, as this would relieve the burden of obtaining computer software and installing the computer software on the user, thereby simplifying computer use, as disclosed by Fawcett in col. 10 lines 50-53.

Per claim 9:

Payne discloses:

- a method on a client server network for the selection, download, and installation of products (Note Figure 1 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- receiving from a software ordering server, an entitlement ID for authorizing the use of the product which has been previously ordered on a client system ("The payment computer is programmed to received the payment message, to cause an access message to be created that comprises the product identifier and an access message authenticator based on a cryptographic key, and to cause the access message to be sent to the merchant computer..." in col. 1 lines 59-64. Further, note Figure 2F, item 86 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)

Art Unit: 2124

- receiving a request from the client system for the download of a copy of the at least one product to the client system, wherein the request includes an entitlement ID used to order the software file (Note Figure 2H, item 92 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- verifying that the entitlement ID received from the ordering server matches the entitlement ID used to order the at least one software file (Note Figure 2H, item 94 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- scheduling the download of the requested product to the client system (“to cause the product to be sent to the user desiring to buy the product...” in col. 2 lines 1-2)

substantially as claimed. Payne does not explicitly disclose that the product is software, nor does Payne disclose verifying the client system's PC compatibility for the requested copy of at least one software file. Fawcett discloses a system enabling a user to view and purchase software for installation and checking the client system's PC compatibility as claimed (“a user selection of desired software...” in col. 11 lines 60-61. Further, note Figure 4A, item 72 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the product distribution system of Payne to allow software distribution and installation as described by Fawcett, as this allow a user to purchase and install software easily via the Internet without the burden of obtaining software from a physical retailer.

Per claim 10:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, Kelley discloses requesting the client system's PC platform type, available storage, installed software, and verifying that one or more responses to

Art Unit: 2124

the requests are within allowable limits as claimed (Note paragraph 0042. The system inherently verifies that the patch will work before installing.)

Per claim 11:

Payne discloses:

- a method on a client server network for the ordering, downloading, and installation of products (Note Figure 1 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- receiving an order entitlement ID for at least one product, which has been previously ordered from a client system on a product ordering server (“The payment computer is programmed to received the payment message, to cause an access message to be created that comprises the product identifier and an access message authenticator based on a cryptographic key, and to cause the access message to be sent to the merchant computer...” in col. 1 lines 59-64. Further, note Figure 2F, item 86 and Figure 2H, item 92, and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- storing the entitlement ID for at least one product in a database (“merchant database...” in col. 3 line 3)
- receiving a request for the down-load of at lest one requested product with a download entitlement ID from a client system (Note Figure 2H, item 92 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- determining if the downloaded entitlement ID matches the order entitlement ID previously stored in the database, and in response to the order entitlement ID matching the download entitlement ID; and scheduling a response to the request for a copy of the at least one product at a scheduling server (Note Figure 2H, item 94 and the corresponding sections of

Art Unit: 2124

the disclosure. Further, “to cause the product to be sent to the user desiring to buy the product...” in col. 2 lines 1-2)

substantially as claimed. Payne does not explicitly disclose that the product is software, nor does Payne disclose the installation of the software product after receiving the software product. Fawcett discloses a system enabling a user to view and purchase software for installation and to automatically install the application independently of the user (“a user selection of desired software...” in col. 11 lines 60-61. Further, “downloading the desired software to the first computer, and installing the desired software on the first computer...” in col. 12 lines 42-44.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the product distribution system of Payne to allow software distribution and installation as described by Fawcett, as this allow a user to purchase and install software easily via the Internet without the burden of obtaining software from a physical retailer.

Per claim 12:

Claim 12 is directed to a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 1.

Per claim 14:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 3.

Per claim 15:

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 15 is directed to a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for performing the method of claim 11, and is rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 11.

Per claim 17:

Payne discloses:

- a software delivery server coupled to a client server network (Note Figure 1 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- a network interface for coupling at least one client system (Note Figure 1 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- an order entitlement ID received over the network interface for at least one product, which has been previously ordered from the at least one client system on a product ordering server (Note Figure 2F, item 86 and Figure 2H, item 92, and the corresponding sections of the disclosure.)
- a download request received over the network interface from at least one of the one or more client systems for a copy of the at least one software file, wherein the request includes an order entitlement ID for at least one product (Note Figure 2H, item 92 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)
- a database used to store the entitlement ID for at least one product (“merchant database...” in col. 3 line 3)
- receiving a request for the download of at least one requested product file with a download entitlement ID from a client system (Note Figure 2H, item 92 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure)

Art Unit: 2124

- means for determining if the download entitlement ID matches the order entitlement ID previously stored in the database, and in response to the order entitlement ID matching the download entitlement ID, scheduling a response to the request for a copy of at least one product at a scheduling server (Note Figure 2H, item 94 and the corresponding sections of the disclosure. Further, “to cause the product to be sent to the user desiring to buy the product...” in col. 2 lines 1-2)

10. Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,715,314 to Payne et al., hereafter referred to as Payne, in view of U.S. Patent 5,845,077 to Fawcett, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0128975 A1 to Klemba et al., hereafter referred to as Klemba.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, neither Payne nor Fawcett explicitly disclose receiving a request for acceptance of a software license agreement, and sending the acceptance to the software delivery server. Klemba discloses in an analogous client/server software distribution system the act of requesting acceptance of a software license agreement, and sending the acceptance to the software delivery server as claimed (“upon agreement of the EULA...” in paragraph 0037). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the license agreement ability of Klemba with the software distribution system of Payne, modified by Fawcett, as this would enable a vendor to impose legal standards on the to-be installed software in the system of Payne, modified by Fawcett.

Art Unit: 2124

Per claim 13:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 2.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trent J Roche whose telephone number is (571)272-3733. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2124

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trent J Roche
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

TJR


KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100